direct.

All on, apply at the Mayor's Office, RICHARD WALLACE, Mayer, RANDOLFE COYLE, W. FORSTE, City Servejor, DAVID HEPBURH, W. B. William Commissioner, Laie Canal Commissioner, Canal Board.

DR. OPOSALS FOR SEWER.

MAYON'S OFFICE, WARRINGTON, April 13, 1866.

SEALED PROPOSALS will be received by the undergreed until 130 stocks m., on WEONISODAL, the like the April war, for the huilding of a Tarce-food Barrett war and the state of the sta

served.

Specifications can be seen at the office of the Cummission on ones of lumpovements twery day between 10 o'clock m. and 12 m.; or at any time by calling on the unmissioner of the Second Ward.

None but practical mechanics used bid.

JAR. W. SPALDING, ap16-4id.

Commissioner Second Ward.

TRESH BEEF AND VEGETABLES.

BURKAR OF PROVISIONS ARE DEFAURTY,
BURKAR OF PROVISIONS ARE CLOTHING,
ALED PROPOGALLS, endorsed "Proposale for Fresh and Vagetables," will be received at this Bureau 3 o'clock p. m., on the 3th day of APRIL, test, and twesty-five thousand pounds of Fresh and twaty-five the Washington, B. C., Navy-Fard and thaquality, and the beat had "vegetables must be of
quality and the beat had a discount of the contract, and and the contract of the contract, which will,
and the collision of the contract, which will,
the collision of the contract, which will,
the collision of the contract, which will,
the collision of the contract of the contract,
the collision of the contract, which will,
the collision of the contract, which will,
the collision of the contract of the contract,
the collision of the contract of the contract,
the collision of the contract,
the collision of the contract of the contract,
the collision of the contract of the contract,
the collision of the contract of the contract
that the contract of the contract of the contract
that the contract of the contract of the contract
that the contract of the contract of the contract
that th

National Republican.

WASHINGTON CITY, D. C.; FRIDAY MORNING, APRIL 20, 1866.

THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

SPEECH OF SENATOR COWAN In the Senate, April 5, Mr. Cowan, of

VOL. VI.

consylvania, said:

In the Senate, April 5, Mr. Cowax, of Pennsylvania, said:

Mr. President, if no arrangement can be arrived at, I propose to say a very few words upon the subject now under consideration by the Senate. I think that the question here is purely one of constitutional law, and upon the determination of that question properly or improperly the fate of the bill ought to depend. I have a very clear and decided opinion of my own on that question. I think the merits of the bill are out of the question really; but as a great many good people think that the bill has intrinsic merits which ought to override the provisions of the Constitution, and ought to become a law, notwithstanding our want of power to pass it. I propose to say a few words, which, if they are not to convince anybody in the Senate, may go to the country and be reflected upon there.

I agree, and am quite willing as an inhabitant of one of the States of this Union, or a citizen, or an elector, or any other word you may choose to use in order to designate me, that all the people of this country shall enjoy the rights conferred upon them by this bill. I have never had any objection to that; and if my own State, Pennsylvania, did not confer all these rights, or almost all of them, certainly the voice of no one in that State should be heard sooner, longer, or louder than my own until they were secured. That all men should have the right to contract, I agree. I might limit the right of a great many people to purchase, and hold real estate, but as a general proposition I would allow them to purchase, hold, and lease, and to be entitled to their remedies for the defence of their property. There is no doubt in my mind about that.

But what I wish to say at the start is, that this bill, even supposing it had all the merit in the world, will not be effective to attain the ends hoped for by its friends; and that, apart from that, its provisions are exceedingly dangerous. Waiving the question of power, therefore, I propose to direct the attention of the Senate to the

line preceding is the nominative to that verb, and supplies all that is needed in the vary of a nominative. I am perfectly free to admit that a fair construction of this section, would be to make that second clause quality is which and to take the whole section as meaning that these persons should only enjoy such rights as are enjoyed by the white persons of the State court of the United States it it is not its grammatical construction; and when we observe, as we do here daily that a carvity and when we find such loose notious prevailing upon the minit part of a hair, to very frequently; and when we find such loose notious prevailing upon the minit part of a hair, to very frequently; and when we find such loose notious prevailing upon the minit part of a hair, to very frequently; and when we find such loose notious prevailing upon the minit part of a hair, to very frequently; and when we find such loose notious prevailing upon the minit part of a hair, to very frequently; and when we find such loose notious prevailing upon the minit part of a hair, to very frequently; and when we find such loose notious prevailing upon the minit part of a hair, to very frequently; and when we find such loose notious prevailing upon the minit part of a hair, to very frequently; and when we find such loose notious prevailing upon the minit part of a hair, to very frequently; and when we find such loose notious prevailing upon the minit part of a hair, to very frequently; and when we find such loose notious prevailing upon the minit part of a hair, to very frequently; and when we find such loose notious prevailing upon the minit part of a hair, to very frequently; and when we find such loose notious prevailing upon the minit part of a hair, to very frequently; and when we find such loose notious prevailing upon the minit part of a hair, to very frequently; and when we observe, saw we do here daily discussed the such as a s

to the State laws it is to be referred whether there was a contract or not, whether the par-ty in contracting was competent and capable to make the contract or not. It is to be re-ferred to the State courts whether there is a title or not, and how that title will be evi-denced, and how it shall be maintained. All

to the State laws it is to be referred whether the party in contracting was competent and capable it to make the contract or not. It is to be referred to the State courts whether there is a title or not, and how it shall be maintained. All if the subjects are purely and exclusively within the domain of the States and the just denced, and how it shall be maintained. All if these subjects are purely and exclusively within the domain of the States and the just denced, and how it shall be maintained. All fifty miles with his little claim in his pocket. What then? He could hardly pay a lawyer is necessary, where disputes arise between distincted to the states of the State of Pennaylvania, I can take him probac wice into the district rourt of the United States, and have an impartial (as was supposed) tribulal there to settle the differences between its. But when he has difficulties with citizens of the State of Pennaylvania, I can take him probac wice into the district rourt of the United States of the State of Pennaylvania, I can take him probac wice into the district or to the United States of the State of Pennaylvania, I can take them with citizens of the State of Pennaylvania, I can take them with citizens of the State of Pennaylvania (as was supposed) tribulant there to settle the differences between its. But when he has difficulties with citizens of the State of Pennaylvania (as was supposed) tribulant there to settle the differences between its. But when he has difficulties with citizens of the State of Pennaylvania (as was supposed) tribulant there to settle the differences between its. But when he has difficulties with citizens of the State of Pennaylvania (as was supposed) tribulant there to settle the differences between its. But when he has difficulties with citizens of the State of Pennaylvania (as was supposed) tribulant there to settle the differences between the its and have an impartial (as was supposed) tribulant the The state of the s

upon by the honorable Senator from Illinois, Il think is unquestionably anomalous, and to me not only anomalous, but atrocious; and to the writ of error. What has been the law of these United States heretofore? When an act of Congress came in contact with a State law, and the judge of the State court decided that the law of Congress was unconstitutional, there was an appeal given to the defeated party to the Supreme Court of the United States in order to determine the constitutionality of the law. But, sir, who until the last few months ever heard of making the judge a criminal because he decided against the constitutionality of a law of the United States? One would think we were being transported back to the dark ages of the world when a man is to be accused and perhaps convicted of a crime who has done nothing more than honestly and conscientiously discharged his duty. I know that the persons of embassadors are sacred, and I know that it is a very high offence against the law of nations, which no civil judge of any court could justify, to invade this sacred right of the embassador, but everybody knows that that is an exceptional case. Everybody knows that in all times and in all ages the judge was punishable who did not respect the person of an embassador. But that is not this case. That analogy will not help the third section of this bill. It is openly avowed upon the floor of the Senate of the United States, in the year of our Lord 1866, in the full bluze and light of the nimeteenth century, that the indictment is to be a substitute for the writ of error, and it is justified because a judge ought to be indicted who violates the sacred person of an embassador, and the judge who decides against him is to be punished as a criminal!

Mr. President, there are in the law facts as well as rules. No enactment in the world can make that a crime which in itself is not a crime. The Congress of the United States, potent as it is within the range of its delegated powers, the Parliament of England, connipotent as it is w

gated powers, the Parliament of England, omnipotent as it is, cannot make that a crime which is not a crime in itself; and to do so is only to convict itself of an absurdity which at some subsequent period, if it does not, it should regret. I ask whether we here are willing to put upon our stafnte-book a provision of that kind? I appeal to Senators of the reforming school, Senators of the progressive school, Senators who declare that their course is forward and onward, will they do this thing?

The Official Advertisements of all the Executive Departments of the Government are Published in this Paper by Authority of THE PRESIDENT. What is the fair construction of that amend what is the fair construction of that amond-ment of the Constitution abolishing slavery? That amendment declares that "neither sla-very nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted"—and that excep-tion might just as well have been left out; it was yet, into the old Ordinance of 1787 and tion might just as well have been left out; it was put into the old Ordinance of 1787, and has been handed down as a kind of traditional heir-loom among the Constitution-makers ever since—"shall exist within the United States or any place subject to their jurisdiction." What was the slavery mentioned there? What was the involuntary servitude mentioned there? Was it the service due force the migrate of the service due force the migrate of the service due.

mentioned there? Was it the service due from the minor to his parent? Was it the right the husband had to the services of his wife? Nobody can pretend that these things were within the purview of that amendment; nobody believes it. It was mentioned as a matter of ridicale, in some places, that it did actually liberate the minor from the control of his never and consultant that it did and matter of ridicule, in some places, that it did actually liberate the minor from the control of his parent and guardian; that it did actually entitle the wife to be paid for her own start of the minor from the control of his parent and guardian; that it did actually entitle the wife to be paid for her own start of the minor from the control of his parent and guardian; that it did actually entitle that they should not go to the husband; but that was false. The true meaning and intent of that amendment was simply to abolished his slavery. That was the whole of it. What did it give to the negro? It abolished his slavery. Wherein did his alavery consist? It consisted in the restraint that another man had over his liberty, and the right that that other had to take the proceeds of his labor. This amendment deprived the master of that right, and conferred it upon the negro. What more did it do? Nothing, by the terms of it, and nobody can construe its terms to extend beyond that. It gave to the negro that which is described in the elementary books of the law as the right of personal liberty. What is the right of personal liberty. What is the right of personal liberty of the right tog owherever one part of any other person.

That is followed by a subsequent clause, in which it is stated that Congress shall have a right to enforce this provision by "appropriate legislation." The appropriate legislation is that legislation which allows personal liberty to the negro and prevents anybody from restraining him in that liberty. Allow me again to refer to the elementary books. The remedies for a restraint upon personal liberty are, first, the habeas corpus, and did shills framed to give to the negro the right to the habeas corpus, to deliver him from restraints which may be exercised over him by anybody, I shall vote for that bill.

Mr. Stewart. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question? Would he not have, under State laws, a right to a writ of habeas corpus without any act of Congress; has he to that right now?

THE NATIONAL REPUBLICAN

PUBLISHED DAILY. THE NATIONAL REPUBLICAN

Is published every morning (Sandays excepted) by W.
J. Murraow & Go., No. 311 Minth street, and is furnished,
to subscribers (by carriers) at 70 cents per month.
Mail subscribers, \$0.00 per anxistm; \$0.00 for six
months; and \$0.00 for three months, fearprintly for advance. Fire copies one year, \$05.00.

Bingin copies, \$0 cents.

THE WREELT NATIONAL REPUBLICAN is published every Friday morning; One capy one year, \$2.00; Three copies one year, \$5.00; Ten cepies one year, \$15.00.

ing the bill, but he would have been false to his eath and recreant to his duty if he had not vetoed it. As I said before, it is not a question as to the merits of the bill; it is not any whether in that respect it is right or is wrong; it is not a question whether its provisions are salutary or whether they are not salutary; it is a question whether we have a right to ness; it

are salutary or whether they are not salutary; it is a question whether we have a right to pass it.

We are here clothed with authority written down, powers enumerated and fixed, and that authority is accompanied by the assertion that powers not delegated we shall not exercise. Then, if this power is not delegated, we have no more right to pass this bill than we would have a right to do any other unlawful thing. It is a hundred times greater infraction of our duty than it could possibly be for a judge, who is made a criminal under this bill, to decide in favor of his own State against its constitutionality. I have no hesitation in saying that.

Mr. President, I have another objection to the bill that is anomalous. This bill provides what I think is entirely new in our jurisprudence, and if it is not, it ought to be; it establishes and pays in every county where the President may choose to appoint them, persons who have no other office than to be public prosecutors. What is to be the business of these officers? They are to be as admonstration as such an officer always has been in every other country. They are to be so nearly akin to the sneak that the one is hardly to be known from the other. They are to pry about, and they are to see that this law is executed, and that all lawgivers, all Governors, all judges, all Juries, everybody who has anything to do with the administration of the State law are punished if there was any one thing well established here among our people, it was that they themselves would enforce the due administration of the eriminal laws.

I believe there is hardly a district attorney

there was any one thing well established here samong our people, it was that they themselves would enforce the due administration of the criminal laws.

I believe there is hardly a district attorney anywhere all over the country who holds himself bound to gegand pry about and seek offences in order that he may take them into his criminal court and have them punished. No, sir, ours has been a very different system—a far more high and dignified one, and and one of which as an American citizen I am proud. Who by the law has been intrusted with the duty of inquiring whether offences are committed or not in your State, in my State? It is the grand inquest of the body of the State or of the country which inquires. It is not the paid, hired informer, who is to get a fixed sum if he catches a criminal, but it is the citizens of the vicinage, drawn, summoned, and sworn to inquire as to these offences, and not only sworn to inquire, but sworn to do what the informer is not sworn to do, and that is, to protect the citizen as well as to punish the criminal. That institution is established by the Constitution of the United States, and by that same instrument it is to "remain as heretofore." By the Constitution, the grand jury and the petit jury are out of the reach even of Congress itself to alter or to change their constitution; and yet here it is proposed to substitute in the room and stead of that bulwark for the security of the citizen he paid and the hired informer in order to see that offences against this bill are punished.

Mr. President, that, to my mind, is another atrocity, and deserves no softer name; and it not only deserves that appellation, but it is an insult to the intelligence of our people and an insult to their institutions that they should not be supposed to know